

WENDY ARTEAGA,)
)
 Plaintiff,) NO. 3:19-cv-00349
)
 v.) JUDGE RICHARDSON
)
 CINRAM-TECHNICOLOR, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 65), wherein the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court grant Defendants' motions to dismiss (Doc. Nos. 50, 53). Plaintiff (who is proceeding *pro se*) has filed a "Motion for Objections Answer" (Doc. No. 70, "Objection"), which the Court will construe as an objection to the Report and Recommendation.

Case 3:19-cv-00349 Document 71 Filed 04/27/22 Page 1 of 3 PageID #: 409

sufficient and may result in waiver of further review. *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995).

The failure to properly, specifically, and timely object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at *2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019). “The filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirement of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object. Moreover, an objection that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate’s suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an objection as that term is used in this context.” *Id.* at *2 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at *3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge’s findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

Although the Court has construed Plaintiff’s Objection as an objection to the Report and Recommendation, that does not mean that it is a proper objection. And in fact it is not a proper objection to the Report and Recommendation. In Plaintiff’s Objection, she merely restates the arguments presented to the Magistrate Judge and does not offer specific objections to the Report and Recommendation. She does not point out specifically where she believes the Magistrate Judge erred, whether it be in fact-finding, in legal analysis, or otherwise. Instead, without any reference to the Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff merely recites her arguments as if she were arguing them in the first instance. Thus, the objections do not meet the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 72

and Local Rule 72.02. Thus, Plaintiff has failed to specifically object to the Report and Recommendation and therefore the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the Report and Recommendation. *See Lawhorn v. Buy Buy Baby, Inc.*, No. 3:20-CV-00201, 2021 WL 1063075, at *1 (M.D. Tenn. Mar. 19, 2021) (Richardson, J.). (“The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made.”); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) (“It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”).

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s purported objections are overruled, and the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 30) is ADOPTED. Defendants’ motions to dismiss (Doc. Nos. 50, 53) are hereby GRANTED. This action is DISMISSED, and the Clerk is directed to close the file. This Order shall constitute final judgment for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE